

### **Remarks**

Claims 67-117 are pending in the application, with claims 67, 80, 90, 104, 107 and 115 being the independent claims. Claims 1-66 been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 67-117 have been added. It is noted that claims 67-117 read on the invention elected (Group III) in the Response to Restriction Requirement dated July 1, 2003.

Based on the present Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### **Allowable claims**

The indication that claims 26, 56 and 57 are allowable is gratefully noted.

**New claim 67 corresponds to claim 26 rewritten in independent form**, including all of the features of claim 26, base claim 16, and intervening claim 22. Claims 68-79 depend from claim 67.

**New claim 80 corresponds to claim 56 rewritten in independent form**, including all of the features of claim 56 and base claim 49. Claims 81-89 depend from claim 80.

Accordingly, claims 67-89 should be in condition for allowance.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 60 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 60 has been canceled.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103**

Claims 16, 18-25, 33-37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over GB 1212963 to Reynolds ("Reynolds"). Claims 17 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,603,058 to Schubert ("Schubert"). Claims 27-32, 49-55, 58, 59, 61-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds.

Generally, independent claims 90, 104, 107 and 115 correspond to canceled claims 16, 33,

49 and 61. In contrast to the canceled claims, claim 90, 104, 107 and 115 each require a single conveyor for supplying a plurality of processing stations. Reynolds does not disclose a single conveyor with several processing stations. Reynolds only discloses conveyors with one processing station each. Schubert fails to cure this deficiency. As such, claims 90, 104, 107 and 115 distinguish over the cited prior art. Claims 91-103 depend from claim 90, claims 105 and 106 depend from claim 104, claims 108-114 depend from claim 107, and claims 116 and 117 depend from claim 115. Accordingly, claims 90-117 are allowable over the cited prior art.

#### Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Appl. No. 10/058,200  
Amendment dated November 5, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2003

A Notice of Allowance with claims 67-117 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/05/03



Chad C. Anderson  
Registration No. 44,505  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-8257  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

DC2DOCS1496862